Disciplinary Proceedings under Rule 20 of IDPL

385. SHRIMATI SARALA MAHESHWARI : Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer given in the Rajya Sabha to the Unstarred Question 1595 dated 3rd December, 1992 and state :

(a) the details of the employees against whom the disciplinary proceedings were contemplated or pending under rule 20 of the IDPL CDA Rules as stated in the question referred to above during 1989-90 and 1990-91 :

(b) the details of the employees against whom disciplinary procedure in case of unauthorised absence from duty for 4 days and less than 30 days was applied under rule 25 of IDPL CDA Rules, as stated in the question referred to above during 1989-90 and 1990-91 ; and

(c) what was the detailed outcome of the proceedings at (b) above conducted under rule 25 ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO) : (a) Rule 20 of the IDPL CDA Rules, 1978 deals with suspension. There was no case of suspension during the relevant period in so far as the transferred employees were concerned.

(b) and (c) Under Rule 25 of IDPL CDA Rules, services of 9 Medical Representatives were terminated between the period from 8-11-1989 to 4-2-1991, both days inclusive. The period of unauthorised absence of all the 9 Medical Representatives was more than 30 days. One of the transferred employees against whom action under Rule 25 was started, is on leave granted as per orders of the Calcutta High Court.

Enquiry Against the IDPL Employees

386. SHRI MD.. SALIM : Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the reply to the Unstarred Question 2910 given in the Rajya Sabha on 18th March, 1993 and state :

(a) what are the details of the directions with dates of June and July, 1989 as stated in the Question referred to above, given by the IDPL management to the said officials alongwith the contents of the copies of directions ;

(b) whether the affected official had told and requested the management eight times in writing that either the official should be cleared or condemned on the charges levelled by the then Director (Mktg.) or not, together with the reasons therefor ;

(c) whether is it a fact that on the request on the said officials, the then Chairman-cum-Managing Director ordered an enquiry for the charges of the then Director (Mktg.) and some department personnel visited the official's house ;

(d) if so, the results of the said enquiry and whether the official was informed about this or not, together with the reasons therefor ;

(e) whether the affected official had applied for leave till the enquiry was completed to cover the period of absence; and

(f) whether the management had sanctioned the leave of the official till May, 1989 through the order of the Senior Personnel Manager, with the reasons therefor ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) The employee referred to in the Question is a former Marketing Executive of IDPL. The authority to take a decision in respect of such employees is the management of the company. IDPL had written letters to the official on 1-6-1989 and again on 2-6-1989 advising him to report for duty at the new place. Another letter was sent by IDPL on 25th July, 1989 advising him to report for duty without putting any pre-conditions.